UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/270,256	03/15/1999	ILYA KLEBANOV	0100.9900440	2265

23418	7590	02/11/2004

VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ
222 N. LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER
YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	22

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/270,256		KLEBANOV, ILYA
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Ryan R Yang		2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 October 2003</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,6-11,13,17,18,21 and 22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2, 6-11,13,17-18,21 and 22</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

11/24/03 has been entered.

2.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 10/9/2003.

This action is non-final.

3.   Claims 2, 5-11, 13, 17-18, 21 and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 21

and 22 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 10/9/2003, claims 5, 21 and

22 were amended, and claims 4 and 19 were canceled.

4.   The present title of the invention is "Method and Apparatus for Rendering an

Image in a Video Graphics Adapter" as filed originally.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claim 21 recites the limitation "storing the at least second portion of the active

decoded video in a first memory associated with the first VGA" in line 11-12. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is not clear the first

memory is the same memory described as the video memory associated with the first

VGA.

7.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. Claim 22 recites limitation "displaying at least a first portion of

the first frame of video at a second VGA in response to a second control signal". Since

a VGA is an adaptor, a video image cannot be displayed on it.

8.   Claims 2, 5-11, 13 and 17-18 are rejected because they are dependent on

rejected independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

10.   Claims 21, 2 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Noble et al. (5,657,046).

        As per claim 21, Noble et al., hereinafter Noble, discloses a method of displaying

active video on a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

        receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from

a video source (Figure 11 Video module #1 where a frame of video is as Figure 3);

        rendering at least a first portion of the first frame of video at the first VGA in

response to a first control signal, wherein the first control signal is a signal specifying a

window location for displaying the active video (Figure 12 Display Control to the Display

Memory Section 71);

storing the at least a first portion of the active video in a video memory

associated with the first VGA (Figure 12 71); and

rendering at least a second portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in

response to a second control signal (Figure 12 channel A or channel B where the

picture is scrolled; Figure 16 where second portion of the first picture is rendered in

second module) and storing the at least second portion of the active decoded video in a

first memory associated with the first VGA (where the other rendered portion is stored in

Display Memory section 71).

11.   As per claim 2, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejection of

independent claim 21, supra, and further discloses the first portion and the second

portion are the same portion (since the video data is scrolled from the first display

device to the second device, the first portion and the second portion are the same

portion).

12.   As per claim 5, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 21, supra, and further discloses the step of reading the second portion of the

active video from the first video memory and storing the at least second portion of the

active video in a first video memory associated with the first VGA (where the scrolled

portion is a second portion and is stored in first video memory 71)).

13.   As per claim 6, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 5, supra, and further discloses the first video memory and second video memory

are accessed by a direct memory access (DMA) controller associated with the first VGA

(Figure 11 12 where the Graphics Computer has the function of Memory Access

Controller).

14.   As per claim 7, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 5, supra, and further discloses the first video memory and second video memory

are accessed by a direct memory access (DMA) controller associated with the second

VGA (Figure 11 12 where the Graphics Computer has control of all Video Module).

15.   As per claim 8, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 21, supra, and further discloses the first VGA is a primary VGA (where Figure 11

Video Module #1 is considered primary), and the second VGA is a secondary VGA

(where Figure 11 Video Module #2 is considered secondary).

16.   As per claim 9, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 21, supra, and further discloses the first VGA is a secondary VGA (where Figure

11 Video Module #1 is considered secondary), and the second VGA is a primary VGA

(where Figure 11 Video Module #2 is considered primary).

17.   As per claim 10, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 21, supra, and further discloses the first VGA and the second VGA are part of a

video wall such that the first frame of active video is displayed across multiple displays

simultaneously (Figure 16 where a frame is displayed across multiple displays

simultaneously).

18.   As per claim 11, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 21, supra, and further discloses the steps of:

receiving at the second VGA a second frame of active video from a second video

source (Figure 12 Channel A and Channel B depicts data from two different sources);

and

rendering at least a portion of the second frame of video at the first VGA (Figure

12 Display Control to the Display Memory Section 71).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noble et

al. as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Lumelsky (4,949,169).

As per claim 13, Noble demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected

claim 21, supra.

noble discloses a system of displaying video on multiple computer displays. It is

noted that Kehlet does not explicitly disclose the step of storing the window location in a

preference file, however, this is known in the art as taught by Lumelsky et al.,

hereinafter Lumelsky. Lumelsky discloses in a video-graphics display window

environment in which the window location is stored in a preference file ("Vertical Sample

Initial Address Register (SYA) 94 and Horizontal Sample Initial Address Register (SXA)

96. These two registers specify the destination window location. Two loadable

counters, Vertical Sampling Address Counter (SYCNT) 98 and horizontal Sampling

Address Counter (SXCNT) 100 are used as pointers to the receiving node's frame

buffer (SYADDR and SXADDR)", column 14, line 30-37).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lumelsky into Noble because Noble discloses a method of displaying video data on multiple display and Lumelsky discloses a method of tacking the window location in order to correctly display the window on different displays.

21.   Claims 22 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noble et al. (5,657,046), and further in view of Lauer et al. (5,523,769).

As per claim 22, Noble discloses a method of displaying active video on a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from a video source (Figure 12 where Channel A and B are inherently connected to a video source); and

displaying at least a first portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in response to a second control signal (Figure 16 where second portion of the first picture is rendered in second module).

Noble discloses a system of displaying video on multiple computer displays. It is noted that Noble does not explicitly disclose the video source is at least one of the following: a video decoder and a television signal. However, this is known in the art as taught by Lauer et al., hereinafter Lauer. Lauer discloses a multiple display system in which "each individual unit or a subgroup is arranged to have its associated module with its own integral processor and memory responsible for font and graphics rendering,

image processing, video decoding, clipping and coordination with adjacent modules",
column 5, line 5-10.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lauer into Noble because teaches a
system of displaying video on multiple computer system and Lauer teaches the video
source can be a coded signal can be decoded by the decoding module in order to be
able to decoding coded signals.

22.   As per claim 17, Noble and Lauer demonstrated all the elements as applied to
the rejection of independent claim 22, supra.

As for the video decoder is for decoding a compressed video signal, it is inherent
that a video signal to be decoded is a compressed signal.

23.   As per claim 18, Noble and Lauer demonstrated all the elements as applied to
the rejection of independent claim 22, supra, and Noble further discloses the video
source sending the first frame of data over a bus local to the first VGA (Figure 12 bus
line between 71 and 7).

Response to Arguments

24.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 5-11, 13, 17-18 and 21-22 have
been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure.

Inquiries

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-**

6133.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office

whose telephone number is (703) 305-47000377.

Ryan Yang
February 5, 2004

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600